POLITICAL ANALYSIS OF PRESENT ARAB CONDITIONS

ISSUED BY
THE NATIONAL LEADERSHIP OF
THE ARAB BAATH SOCIALIST PARTY
SEPTEMBER 3, 1975

POLITICAL ANALYSIS OF
PRESENT ARAB CONDITIONS

ISSUED BY
THE NATIONAL LEADERSHIP OF
THE ARAB BAATH SOCIALIST PARTY
SEPTEMBER 3, 1975
Documentary Series (43)

In a comprehensive statement on present Arab conditions, issued in Baghdad, September 3, 1975, the Nationalist Leadership of the Arab Baath Socialist Party condemned the new settlement agreement recently concluded between the Egyptian Regime and the Zionist enemy. Following is the full text of this statement.

STATEMENT OF
THE NATIONAL LEADERSHIP OF
THE ARAB BAATH SOCIALIST PARTY
ON
PRESENT ARAB CONDITIONS

Extremely grave events and developments are taking place at present on the Arab scene. In our opinion, these events and developments are neither new nor surprising. They have, for long, been anticipated by our party which, in its analysis and attitudes, has been warning against them over the past eight years, i.e., since the defeat of June, 1967, up to now.

What is happening at present, is only the expected sequel to the policy of "peaceful settlement" pursued by certain Arab regimes and political forces, prompted and encouraged by diverse international parties despite differences in their nature, intentions and designs.

This policy goes back to the period following the defeat of June 1967, becoming more pronounced and comprehensive after the ceasefire in October 1973.

The general graphic line of conduct of those parties reveals retreat on all levels: retreat from the central nationalist objective of liberating Palestine and retreat from the genuine line of Arab revolution aiming at unity, socialism and democracy.

In Syria, at the time of ceasefire, October 1973, this policy led, in addition to the aforesaid, to withdrawal, before the enemy, even from the land. As a result of the acceptance of ceasefire by the Syrian regime which refused to launch the offesive scheduled to take place on the Golan Front, in collaboration with the Iraqi troops on the eve of October 22, 1973, the Zionist occupation extended to cover extra lands other than those occupied in June 1967.

This retreat which constitutes a general and definite characteristic of the movement of the above-mentioned Arab parties over the past years, has not always taken a direct and fully distinct course. Nor has it occured over a coordinated chronological period, as far as the parties in question, are concerned. It has taken a course which, quite often, was complicated and indirect, stretching over

several chronological stages. Various means have been employed, some of which seem to be apparently contradicting. Yet, notwithstanding their outward diversity and contradiction, they come harmoniously under the general line of retreat, and are connected with its present outcome which we are witnessing today with much distinctness, and whose responsibility is borne by the above-mentioned Arab and international parties, with no exception whatever.

One of the basic characteristics of this retreat which extended, as mentioned, over the past eight years, is that it involved a large-scale, vicious, complex process to mislead and temper the masses, imposing on them the partial, consecutive, accumulated effects of the retrogressive policy of "peacefull settlement". This has been delivered in doses and instalments so as the mentioned parties, might, each under its own conditions and by its own methods, avert strong direct popular resistance, disrupt any resistance which may form here and there, and place the masses in a state of permanent wide-scale bewilderment and uncertainty which may sometimes, verge on a state of anaesthesia.

In the course of this general process which has been going on for many years,

the above-mentioned parties resorted to such facilities and means which, though different, finally met on the same ground. Generally speaking, the movement of the Egyptain regime has been marked by a relatively perceptible degree of frankness and directness, in comparison to that of the other Arab parties. The Egyptain regime accepted, right from the beginning, Resolution 242 which, implicitly provides for the recognition of the Zionist entity. Right from the beginning too, it announced that it would adhere to the line of peaceful solution and, would accept any important American role to reach the so-called "peaceful settlement". That, however, was clear even before the acceptance by the Egyptain regime of the Rogers Plan. And obviously, it became more so, after accepting it. Whereas other Arab parties which pretended to reject Resolution 242, proclaming an anti-Rogers attitude on the propaganda level, were, in substance, ultimately following the Egyptain example, soon to announce that they accepted the said Resolution and the American role in the post October settlement.

Compared with the other parties, the Egyptain regime was, over the last two years, in particular, more direct and frank; and consequently, less complicated in expressing its policies and intentions. Offic-

ials in Egypt continued to publicly confirm their dependence on, and confidence in the American role, and their readiness to reach, together with the Zionists, a settlement incorporating the recognition of, and co-existence with the enemy. The features marking the Egyptian regime are, in addition to the characteristics of that regime, the product of the objective circumstances of Egypt.

The "direct" outcome of handling nationalist issues in a nationalist environment, by the Egyptain regime, over the last twenty years, has been one of failure and loss. Cases to be mentioned are the secession experience[1], the Yemen experience, the dedefeat of June and many other experiences. As nationalists and revolutionaries, we know that the real cause of failure and loss is not to be attributed to being committed to nationalist issues and to fighting for them, for all the sacrifices demended thereby. Rather it should be ascribed to the grave errors committed in this respect, and to failure to insure all the requirements of struggle for nationalist and social issues. Failure and

....

(1) The secession of Syria from the U.A.R. in 1961.

loss, however, have been the concrete fact seen on the surface for quite a long time. The imperialist circles and reactionary forces, along with submissive and suspect elements, have made use of this fact to justify the trends of internal counter-revolution, and the abandonment of nationalist issues by means of a deviating evil method which lacks no power of influencing though temporarily, considerable segments of the masses and even certain sections of patriots in Egypt.

Besides, a point to be mentioned, is the abuse and deviating interpretation of the so-called international variables and international detente, on the one hand; and the concurrence of all international big powers, both imperialist and progressive, on the so-called peaceful settlement, on the other.

Another factor should be mentioned in this connection, i.e. the stifling economic crisis which, has been, for many years, taking hold of Egypt crushing the Egyptian masses.

If this economic tragedy which Egypt is suffering, is to be examined in the light of the exorbitant wealth and spending shown by certain Arabs, and the false deviating line conducted by suspicious information media, which concentrate on this point depiciting the matter as though impoverished and cru-

shed Egypt was expected to continuously endure and offer sacrifices, while those extravagantly wealthy Arabs offering Egypt and the cause nothing worthwhile, we can realize the depth of the restless and coercive psychological ground which is being used by the forces of counter-revolution, in a fraudulent swerving manner, to justify the abandonment of nationalist issues and nationalist commitments.

This analysis, however, must not be considered as an "excuse" for the policy advocated by the Egyptian regime whether on the internal level, or as regards the Arab cause. Nor should it be viewed as a move to diminish the responsibility of that regime.

Our Party has a clear principled political attitude toward right-wing and renegade trends in Egypt and in other parts of the Arab homeland. It has also a clear principled political attitude toward those trends fostering peaceful settlement as a whole; whatever hues or forms they may take, and whatever elements, local or external, they may be composed of. Armed by confidence and conviction in the Arab masses and their revolutionary movement, we reject and resist all those trends advocating settlement, which we consider to ultimately be one and the same thing, though the circumstances,

deliberations and intentions of the parties concerned, may differ. This is being so by reason of the fact that we are convinced, as has been reaffirmed by successive experiences, that under the present Arab conditions, and within the context of current relations, the "peaceful settlement" is connected dialectically with retrogression from nationalist conceptions and commitments, as well as with retrogression heading downward to fall into the traps of imperialist schemes and influence. And this, as a matter of fact, stands against the national interests of the countries concerned and against the nationalist interest, as a whole.

As for the ruling regime in Syria, the methods it has been following in connection with the regressive policy of "peaceful settlement", are in may instances, different from those adopted by the Egyptian regime, which, generally speaking, are marked by frankness and directness. The methods pursued by the Syrian regime have, quite often, been complicated, intricate and indirect, but in substance and as regards final results, they are in concert with the movement of the Egyptian regime and its basic trends heading towards "peaceful settlement" and its retrogressive contents.

One might say that the stand of the

Syrian regime regarding this question is identical to that of the Egypiatn regime, though it is lagging behind by several weeks or several months, and is produced in a different garment. It could also be said that the Syrian regime is using the Egyptian regime as a mine-sweeper to receive explosions so that when the road is freed, the Syrian regime may proceed with minimum losses.

Prior to the war of October, 1973, the Syrian regime pretended to reject Resolution 242 of the Security Council. But by concenting to ceasefire on October 22, 1973, and by accepting Resolution 338 of the Security Council, which incorporates acceptance of Resolution 242, it did accept that Resolution.

The Syrian regime placed the blame for ceasefire on October 22, 1973, on the Egyptian regime, justifing its own position as being the outcome of a force majeure. The truth, however, is that it was the Syrian regime which first called for ceasefire by asking the Soviet Union, a few days after the outbreak of war, to arrange for a ceasefire. But the Soviet Union stipulated that that should be done with the approval of Egypt which, then, did not agree to a ceasefire. This fact has been revealed by the Soviet leaders, as well as by President Sadat.

The Syrian regime used to attack, every now and then, American imperialism and its intentions. But like the Egyptian regime, it concented to American imperialism playing a major role in reaching the peaceful settlement.

While the Egyptian regime expresses readiness to conclude a peace treaty with the enemy frankly and in public, the head of the Syrian regime stresses the same before American officials and American journalists, but soon, his information apparatus would come out with "modified" versions of those statements for internal use.

When the first "disengagement" of forces took place on the Egyptian Front, the Syrian regime made a show of being angry and exchanged gunfire with the Zionist enemy, with the pretension at being engaged in "a war of attrition". But before long, it signed an agreement of "disengagement" with the enemy, recovering accordingly, and for all the sacrifices of the glorious war of October, and for what it called "a war of attrition", a few kilometers of the Golan territory. Further, it assented to the U.N. forces forming a buffer zone between Syria and the enemy who is still occupying the Syrian soil and other Arab lands. Recently, it has extended the mandate of the U.N. forces for

six months instead of the customary period of only three months.

As the rightist forces in Egypt have been preaching the so-called opening policy which, eventually means reversal from the socialist line, and a come-back of imperlialist economic influence, Syria has been likewise, witnessing for years, similar steps, namely, the revival of local bourgeoisie and rightist forces, the spread on a wide scale, of corruption, the inflow of loans, assistance and investments from America and other western countries. Matters amounted to the point of granting oil concessions to Amrican imperialist monopolies in Syria, at a time when even those states having deep-rooted relations with the United States set to limiting American privileges and bases in their territories.

The methods adopted by the Syrian regime to proceed along with the retrogressive line of "peaceful settlement" are the product not only of the wily immoral characteristics distinguishing its leadership, but are also produced by the objective circumstances surrounding that regime.

Historically speaking, Syria has been a field of nationalist radiation and nationalist appeal. The Baath movement originated there whence it spread to other Arab count-

ries. The mission of liberating Palestine had been a sacred cause that, in the past, no ruler ever dared to disavow. It was inside that principled psychological setting that the Syrian masses, as well as the Syrian army, were developed.

In view of these characteristics, Syria differs from Egypt in that the nationalist appeal here, has been relatively weaker. Consecquently the nationalist will and nationalist conceptions have come to be relatively of a greater weight in Syria than in Egypt.

Moreover, the present ruling faction in Syria has been compelled to assume the name of the Arab Baath Socialist Party with the purpose of screening and letting through the crime it committed against the Party on February 23, 1966, when it staged a bloody military coup. But as the question of liberating Palestine constitutes a central issue in the idiology and struggle of the Arab Baath Socialist Party, this faction has been unable to easily let pass its abandonment of the cause of liberation. What may make matters more complicated and grave for the Syrian regime, is the existence, just in its vicinity, of a revolutionary nationalist regime in Iraq, led by the Baath Party which is strongly raising high the banner of nationalist prin-

ciples and that of the cause of liberating Palestine. Hence the ruling faction in Syria, could have no free hand to falsify the principles of the Party and the objectives of nationalist struggle. Under these circumstances, it has been compelled to adopt complicated, intricate and indirect methods to let through its policies, exerting arduous efforts to plot against the revolutionary regime in Iraq, try to isolate it and distort its stands, so that it may freely go ahead with its trecherous conduct. Thinking that if Iraq could be successfully kept away from the war of October, the Syrian faction fancied that it would be able to freely handle the settlement policy under a smoke screen of accusing Iraq of being reluctant to fulfil its commitments. With this purpose in mind, it collaborated vigorously and maliciously in the attempts of isolating Iraq from the battle, keeping it uninformed thereof. But soon on hearing the news of war, the revolutionary regime in Iraq participated in the battle employing all its forces and possibilities, fulfilling thereby, its nationalist duty and foiling the conspiracy of the ruling faction in Syria.

The Syrian regime, on the other hand, is fully aware of the surreptitious aspects and intricacies of "the peaceful settlement" advocated by American imperialism. It knows

just as well, that as regards withdrawal in the Golan Hights, the enemy maintains a stand harder than that regarding withdrawal in the Sinai. In this respect, American imperialism is backing the enemy stand although it maintains a relatively different attitude. It holds that the Syrian regime should be given something which may make possible the continuation of the settlement line, on the part of this regime, within the farmework of the existing delicate conditions, cited above, and prevent its collapse under revolutionary nationalist forces which reject the settlement policy, totally and circumstantially. In view of that, American imperialism does not feel much disturbed of the Syrian propaganda warfare, nor of its flagrant "moves", for, being the godfather of "peaceful settlement", it is well aware of the rules and conditions of the game.

By reason of the methods of the Syrian regime and its complicated, intricate and indirect moves the nationalist cause is being exposed to a grave danger, since, first, those methods and moves are mainly intended to mislead national and revolutionary forces, divert their course, split their ranks and draw them into the pitfalls of submissive settlement and nationalist treachery; and second; as resisting the methods and trends adopted by the Syrian

regime is far more difficult and complicated than resisting open, retrogressive direct methods and trends. In view of that, the revolutionary, conscious forces abiding by the course of liberation and the genuine line of the movement of Arab revolution, are called upon to concentrate their efforts and launch a multi-phased struggle to expose the methods and attitudes advocated by this revisionist regime which is playing the most dangerous role against the Arab cause.

Over the past months, this regime has staged two gravely dangerous moves: first, calling for the creation of what it named the joint Syrian-Palestinian Political Military Command, and second, concluding an agreement with Jordan titled as the United Syrian-Jordanian Command.

Shedding light on the essence of these two moves is of prime importance as it serves to unmask the intentions and suspicious evil schemes of this regime. It will also expose some of the serious aspects of the game of settlemet which is threatening the Palestinian question, right in the core, and the whole of the region with the most dangerous imperialist reactionary counter- revolution. that may be seen in modern history.

Last March the Syrian regime announ-

ced unilaterally plans for setting up what it called the joint Syrian-Palestinian Political Military Command. In view of the fact that certain elements of the Palestinian leadrships colluded with the Syrian regime, getting involved in the settlement line, and due to the repressive measures and blackmailing exercised by that regime against the Palestinian resistance. on the one hand, and by reason of the perils menacing to strike and liquidate the Palestinian resistance on the Lebanese scene, on the other; the leadership of the Palesinian Liberation Organization was forced to comply with the Syrian move, although, so far, this scheme did not fully materialize as desired by the Syrian regime.

By that plan the Serian regime sought to get the PLO entangled, along with Syria and other parties, in the peaceful settlement plan, totally and circumstantially. This, however, involves the acceptance of Resolutions 242 and 338, going to Geneva, entering into direct negotiations with the Zionists, recognizing the enemy and acknowledging the usurpation of the Palestinian soil occupied before 1967. This, as a matter of fact, goes in harmony with the wishes of certain Palestinian submissive opportunist leaderships which feel that it might be far easier for them, at the present juncture, not to be

directly engaged in the settlement game, but to do so, through the band-waggon of the Syrian regime, until matters would materialize and get ultimately clear, as in this way, they may avoid the resistance of the Pelestinian masses and their rejection of this devious course. On the other hand, the Syrian regime is trying to cover, by this move, its deviating policy and avoid the resistance of the Syrian army and people and that of the Arab masses, as well. Moreover, by means of a fake Palestinian cover that portrays the matter as though Syria were proceeding along with the PLO on the "same and one line", the Syrian regime is seeking to avoid the continuous exposure of its stands, by the Party and its revolutionary regime in Iraq.

The Syrian regime is intending, by the same move, to exert tactical pressure on the Egyptian regime in the hope that Egypt may not go too far on the road of unilateral settlement, leaving no tangible share for Syria. It is also intending to use tactical pressure to make the United States exert more efforts to bring about further partial withdrawal in the Golan Hights, so that it may go ahead with the policy of peacefull settlement, and avoid further storms and crisis that are surrounding that regime.

We can hereby see that this regime, unable to achieve the national objective of liberating the Golan Hights, is trying to enlist, in a suspicious manner, the nationalist factor, (the PLO) with the hope of attaining a partial aim, specifically another partial withdrawal in the Golan Hights, which may enable it remain in power for a longer period of time. While doing that, the Syrian regime does not feel worried to sacrifice the nationalist objective, i.e., the liberation of Palestine, by involving the PLO in its swerving submissive line.

As for the second move staged by the Syrian regime to proclaim the so-called United Syrian-Jordanian Command, last August, it is a new attempt to envelop the Palestinian resistance and force it join its submissive liquidating scheme. This explains the fevrish activities which that regime is now carrying out to draw the PLO into an agreement with Jordan. It also explains its suspicious role on the Lebanese scene.

As known, the role of the PLO in the plan of "peaceful settlement" has so far been one of the biggest problems for which, no final solution could yet be found by the parties concerned.

Moreover, despite its official announcement that it would abide by the resolution of

Al Rabat Summit Conference, concerning the representation of the Palestinian people, and disregarding any intentions, the Jordanian regime, on the other hand, is facing difficulties and serious complications in carrying out its commitments as a result of the human, economic and organizational weight of the Palestinian presence in the Jordanian State and particularly in the Eastern Bank. The Jordanian regime therefore, is in favour of the formula of the "United Kingdom", which it had proposed in 1972 but was rejected by the PLO and all the detachments of the Palestinian Resistance Movement, at the time.

By trying to enlist the PLO in the United Syrian-Jordanian Command, the Syrian regime and the other parties advocating settlement are seeking to reduce differences between the PLO and the Jordanian regime, and to find out a formula standing midway between the resolution of Al Rabat Summit Conference and the scheme of the "United Kingdom". The Syrian regime, along with the other parties involved in settlement, is thus hoping to solve two major problems which, at present, are hindering the "peaceful solution":

A. The problem of the Jordanian regime which is willing to retain the Western

Bank and the ensuing effects which this may have on the United States and consequently, on the Zionist enemy.

B. The problem of representing the PLO at the settlement game and at any direct or indirect negotiations with the enemy.

This may explain the welcome accorded to the Syrian-Jordanian agreement by all the parties advocating the settlement line, in spite of the illusive propaganda which described that agreement as being one aiming at coordinating matters of "peace and war". It is, however, an established fact that this agreement is one for coordination, involvement and deception with a view to achieve "the peaceful settlement". This is not the road leading to war. The road leading thereto lies in responding to the call voiced last July by President Ahmed Hassan Al-Bakr, on behalf of Iraq, by rejecting Resolutions 242 and 338 of the Security Council, and the peaceful settlement, as well as by immediately setting up the northern Front and working out a long-term plan of struggle for complete liberation.

By proclaiming the recent agreement with Jordan, the Syrian regime is once again trifling with one of the scared nationalist objectives, namely, "Unity". It has been falsifying this objective for the sake of attaing

targets which run counter to the essence of nationalist struggle, i.e., targets of the submissive settlement and liquidating the Palestinian question. The Syrian regime has, moreover, impaired this glorious objective of struggle, by putting it into practice in such a scandalous opportunist manner. No ruler has ever dared, all through previous attempts for setting up a federation or unity, to pronounce a formula like the current Syrian-Jordanian one. As matters stand, Syria is a republican State, whereas, Jordan is a monarchy. The Syrian regime claims to be socialist and to be led by "the Baath Party", while the Jordanian regime is monarchical, capitalist and has solid relations with the United States and the Western camp. Besides, we cannot forget that until a few weeks before the proclamation of the agreement with Jordan, the Syrian regime was piling up accusations against the revolutionary regime in Iraq, because the Iraqi army did not strike at the Jordanian regime in 1970. And now, the Syrian regime, in spite of all that, is entering into unity with that very regime.

This attitude of the Syrian regime embodies the lowest grade of opportunism and stabbing nationalist issues and nationalist conceptions.

Once again, it will be useful to make further comparison between the attitudes of the

Egyptian regime and those of the Syrian regime. It should be noted that this is not intended to reduce the responsibility of anybody, as our position concerning this matter is well known and quite clear, but rather, to encounter the grave illusive atmosphere which is intended to be dominating throughout the region.

The stand advocated by the Egyptian regime in respect to the peaceful settlement will, at the point of attaining its scheduled end, lead to set Egypt apart from the question of liberating Palestine, (as is clearly evidenced by the agreement recently concluded with the enemy), something which, in fact is, a major loss for the nationalist cause. As for the stands of the Syrian regime, they aim at complete liquidation of the Palestinian issue, morally and materially.

Egypt, in spite of its tremendous military, political and human weight, by means of which it has always made fundemental contributions in the regular military conflicts with the Zionist enemy, and on the grounds of the nature of the Sinai territory and strategic factors, never constituted an important post in the revolutionary armed struggle of the Palestinian masses and, the Arab masses taking part in the fight against the enemy. On the other hand, Sinai, for the same rea-

son, did not constitute a strategic position whence a fatal blow might be dealt to the depths of the Zionist entity.

By contrast, the Syrian and Jordanian Fronts constitute a perfect soil for armed mass struggle against the enemy. Since 1948 until 1967, these two Fronts constituted an ideal strategic position wherefrom the Arabs might, when an opportunity offered itself, deal a fatal blow to the depth of the Zionist entity. In the confrontations which preceeded 1967, each bullet fired from either of the two Fronts, hit target on the enemy front. This accounts for the position taken by the Zionist enemy in regard to withdrawal in the Golan Hights and the West Bank, which is much harder than its postiton regarding withdrawal from the Sinai. Thus, when these two vital Fronts become silent, by virtue of the liquidating schemes of the Syrian regime, developing as scheduled by the peaceful settlement, into security walls to protect the Zionist enemy, and when the Palestinian resistance is drawn into the settlement plans by means of the malicious crooked methods, referred to above, complete liquidation of the Palestinian question will follow; a wish desired by the imperialist and reactionary forces, and a dream the Zionist have, for decades, been dreaming.

"The Palestinian State" envisaged with-

in the framework of settlement by the parties concerned, could, by no means, become a base for liberation. It would rather, by virtue of the logic of settlement, the forces acting thereupon and the arrangements which are at present underway, be a mini-state, or even a protectorate subject to the influence of imperialism and Zionism, as well as, the influence of the regimes involved in settlement-the regimes which may bring their liquidating schemes to completion only by making a full swing from the nationalist, liberating and progressive line.

The fighting Arab masses which are seeing with their very eyes the gravity of the present situation, are called upon to launch a resolute struggle in order to expose the conspiratorial liquidating trends, and reveal all those methods inteded to spread confusion and illusions, since a sound fighting line could not be established in the absence of a clear vision. The presence of deceptive elements and falsifiers is a matter of grave consequence. It follows from that, that one of the primary tasks of the masses and revolutionaries, is to clear the field of these elements and of their evil effects, so as the nationalist revolutionary action may take the right channel whatever difficulties and sacrifices there may be involved. We stress the necessity of struggle against those opportunist,

double-dealing stands which, focus on one side of the liquidating schemes currently underway, trying at the same time, to cover up and justify those who are involved in the same schemes betraying thereby nationalist principles and objectives. The masses have got averse to those stands, realizing their tactical purposes which have nothing to do with the genuine revolutionary stands and, which, disregarding intentions and justifications, may contribute to facilitate bringing about settlement and the imperialist reactionary counter-revolution which is, dialectically and inseparably associated with the settlement.

To conclude this analytical statement, we confirm the realistic revolutionary programme proposed by Comrade Ahmed Hassan Al-Bakr, President of the Iraqi Republic, last July. This programme defines accurately and scientifically the road which should be followed by Arab revolutionary forces and Arab regimes having real faith in liberation, in order to confront the grave danger menacing the nation and its fundemental issues of liberation, unity and social progress. In this connection, it would be advisable to reproduce the following quoted from the speech delivered by Comrade Ahmed Hassan Al-Bakr, last July:

"More than eight years have elapsed since the new aggression was committed by the Zionist enemy against the Arab nation in 1967.

"Supported and backed up by world imperialism, American imperialism in particular, the enemy is still occupying all the territory of Palestine, Sinai and the Golan [Hights] in Egypt and Syria.

"In spite of the propaganda and hopes which accompanied the so-called peaceful settlement, and in spite of the illusions publicised about the American promises, the Zionist enemy, after those eight long dark years, and with the support of American imperialism, is refusing to withdraw from the territories occupied in 1967, and is imposing humiliating terms for any partial valueless move which, together with American imperialism, it may exhibit.

"We have repeatedly warned and made it known, that this designed Zionist imperialist policy aims at tempering certain Arab regimes and the Arab masses, to make them accept concessions and retreats, one after the other, so that the parties interested in the so-called peaceful settlement may be able to portray the acceptance of Resolutions 242 and 338 as though it were a victory or a great political gain, in spite of the fact

that these two resolutions incorporate, in letter and spirit, the recognition of the Zionist entity and conceding the territories it occupied in 1967, against its withdrawal from some of the territories occupied afterwards.

"Grave deception is contained in this practice as it ignores the Arab rights in Palestine, portraying the question as though it had started in 1967, pretending to forget that the present generation has rejected, from the beginning, the Zionist occupation of the Palestinian soil, that it has been fighting, for long years, to get it liberated, and that what had happened in 1967 had been caused by the occupation of 1948.

"The confirmation of these principles and facts does not stem from fanatical positions, nor does it stem from a desire to embarrass others or from disregarding realistic considerations, as portrayed by certain known quarters. It is the product of two fundamental considerations; first, is that the Zionist entity, by its very nature, by its organic connection with imperialism, and by assuming the role of its commissioner in this sensetive area, could not be but aggressive and expansionist. Second, is that the Arab nation is not incapable of attaining all its legitimate rights wherefore it would renounce some of those rights in order to obtain others.

"With the big human, economic and military resources it possesses and the position it occupies in the international community, the Arab nation is not weak, nor is it incapable of combating the Zionist aggression, as portrayed by elements colluding with imperialism and those who have little confidence in the ability and the possibilities of their nation. Mobilizing these energies of the nation, or any important part of them, bringing them together within the framework of a militant serious long-term plan, utilizing all available circumstances and establishing international relations corresponding to the strategic target, will enable the nation to attain its objectives of complete liberation. If it was not possible to fully attain that strategic target within any particular stage, the nation may undertake significant steps on the road leading thereto, without being forced to resign neither that objective nor its historical rights.

"As for the international public opinion, it is delusive to say that it will not stand on our side unless we accept Resolutions 242 and 338, and renounce our legitimate rights in Palestine.

"In principle, a fair world public opinion declines to have an aggressor rewarded for aggression. And in principle too, it declines

to permit an aggressor to dictate his own terms in order to withdraw from territories he occupied by force; a thing which we ought to fight for, to be affirmed in the international arena. Had Arab diplomatic and information activity been conducted in this correct channel over the past eight years, we would have won wide world support for our legitimate and fair stand.

"Diplomatic and information activities must be conducted by coordinating Arab efforts with the efforts of our friends in the world to have a resolution issued by the competent international bodies, forcing the Zionist enemy to unconditionally withdraw from the Arab territories occupied in 1967. These territories belong to sovereign states which are members of the United Nations. This is an acceptable practice regarding international principles and laws. It had been applied many times in different parts of the world, and was applied in the very Arab homeland in 1956, when the Zionist enemy was compelled to withdraw from Sinai without having Egypt and the Arabs been forced to negotiate with it or recognize it.

"Politically, militarily and economically, the Arab nation today is not weaker to assent to what it could not be compelled to accept twenty years ago. Besides, its inter-

national relations and position are definitely stronger and wider.

"Proceeding from positions of deep concern for the unity of Arab efforts and the unity of Arab ranks, and out of a true desire to fruitfully and fraternally cooperate with our brethren in the concerned Arab countries, we stress the necessity of mobilizing Arab military, economic and political powers, within the framework of a serious militant and long-term plan, in conformity with the bases we have stated. We are convinced and are confident that the Arab nation shall, in this way, attain better positions. We maintain that the time has come for the immediate formation of a northern military front between us and sister Syria and, for the presence of Iraqi troops on the Syrian territory provided that the Syrian government clearly announces rejection of Resolutions 242 and 338, and the Geneva Conference, in the light of the bases we have stated, and adheres to the militant line which regards the Syrian occupied territory in the Golan [Hights] as a part of a whole, considering its liberation a step on the road of liberating Palestine and all the usurped Arab territories.

"We believe that the time has come for the Jordanian front to be opened to encounter the aggression, and that it should be

sustained by multiple Arab military and economic supplies. Similarly we believe that the Egyptian front should be sustained by extensive Arab economic facilities and military supplies from the Arab Maghreb countries.

"The mobilization of Arab energies on this basis shall create an appropriate climate for a sound effective employment of the political facilities, according to the controls we have defined, without rendering unserviceable, the more effective method; the method of struggle, including the use of military force, when Arab subjective conditions and prerequisites and convenient international conditions will be made available.

"We also stress the necesity of proper and effective use of the formidable Arab economic power when conducting political action, providing the prerequisites of the military battle or, confronting the Zionist enemy and the foreign powers standing on its side.

"We are confident that by so mobilizing and directing Arab energies, a strong international support shall be accorded to the Arab nation. It is necessary, however, to emphasize here that the peoples' and nations' will, plays a decisive role, not only in determining their destiny, but

also in steering the course of world public opinion and international policy. The stronger this will becomes, and the more practicable concrete accomplishments it achieves, the more respected it would be by international powers, and the more support it would be accorded by international public opinion. This fact is confirmed by our nationalist experience. International understanding of the Palestinian issue is stronger and wider today than it used to be, by virtue of the struggle of the Palestinian people themselves, their great sacrifices and the role of the Palestinian resistance movement. The support and respect gained by the Arabs in the international community after the October War is stronger and wider than before the war, even among friends. The same applies to the so-called fait accompli. By their militant will, the peoples are capable of decisively changing what, at a certain stage, might be called, a fait accompli. This fact is confirmed by our nationalist experience and the experiences of other peoples.

"While stressing this line which we consider realistic and logical, we are deeply concerned not to see the gaps existing in the Arab ranks, get wider. We are also deeply concerned to see the best conditions be provided for consolidating these ranks,

at any available standard, on the road of liberation.

"But in spite of this great concern of ours, silence at errors, could not be admitted as a price for that. We are committed, in principle and militantly, before the Arab masses, to explain the dimensions of facts and what we deem correct, exerting, at the same time, the greatest and the most sincere efforts, to create conditions of understanding and produce the least possible solidarity and cohesion that would not contradict principled standpoints and strategic targets".

On the basis of this analysis and in conformity with the principles of our Party, the Arab Baath Socialist Party, and the principles of the progressive nationalist struggle waged by the Arab masses, we condemn and denounce the agreement recently concluded between the Egyptian regime and the Zionist enemy.

Baghdad 3.9.1975

رقم الايداع فى المكتبة الوطنية ببغداد
(٨٤٤ لسنة ١٩٧٥)

Al-Hurriya Printing House — Baghdad

1975